APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/201,749	12/01/1998	PING-WEN ONG	11	1977

7590   04/17/2003

Ryan, Mason & Lewis
1300 Post Rd.
Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER
COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/201,749	ONG, PING-WEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ella Colbert	3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 March 2002_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _19_ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-23, 25, 27, and

28 have been amended in this communication filed 03/03/02 entered as Amendment C,

paper no. 18.

2.   The Change of Address filed 03/03/02 has been entered as paper no. 17.

3.   The IDS filed 10/31/02 has been considered and entered as paper no. 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ingrassia, Jr. et al (US 5,941,957), hereafter Ingrassia in view of (US 6,125,371)

Bohannon et al, hereafter Bohannon.

With respect to claim 1, Ingrassia teaches, receiving a request for the electronic

document, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated

with a desired version of the electronic document (col. 7, lines 30-38 and lines 57-65)

and identifying as a function of the creation time-stamp and the requested timestamp a

machine storing a version of the electronic document having a creation time

corresponding to the requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22).   Ingrassia did not

teach, transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp

from the identified machine.

Bohannon discloses transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine (col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine and in view of Ingrassia's teachings of the web browser sending requests via a network and the WTS server creating a session for the browser based on a unique ID and issuing a timestamp and storing the URL and timestamp of a web page in col. 7, lines 30-65 and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to know the time the electronic document was transmitted from the server and stored in a URL history list and a command list created for the session.

With respect to claim 2, Ingrassia teaches, an address identifying the document includes the creation time-stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to claim 3, Ingrassia teaches, the address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-22 and fig. 6).

With respect to claim 4, Ingrassia the Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said requested time stamp (col. 9, lines 5-26).

With respect to claim 5, Ingrassia did not teach, transmitting the version of said electronic document with the most recent creation time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the version of the electronic document with the

most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the

electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp in view of Ingrassia's

teachings of ("Before loading web page 224, the following events occur : (a) browser

114A instructs Master Applet 124A to stop routine, (b) via socket connection established

for browser 114A and web page 214A, Master Applet 124A sends a command to inform

WTS server 144 that web page 214 has been unloaded, and disconnects the socket

connection established for browser 114A and web ...".) in col. 8, line 61-67 and col. 9,

line 1-27 because such a modification in Ingrassia would allow Ingrassia's system to

know when the time-stamp was issued, received, and the URL stored into the session

(a session is defined as a collection of web page interactions that occur over a given

period of time).

With respect to claim 6, Ingrassia teaches, the request is specified using a

browser (col. 7, lines 11-15 and lines 30-65).

With respect to claim 7, Ingrassia teaches, the requested time-stamp is a relative

time-stamp (col. 7, lines 57-65).

With respect to claim 8, Ingrassia teaches, a memory (col. 4, line 51, col. 7, lines

45-49 and col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58) and a processor (col. 4, line 48-51).

Independent claim 8 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 9 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale

given for claim 9.

With respect to claim 10 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale

given for claim 3.

With respect claim 11 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 12 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 13 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 14 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 15, Ingrassia teaches, a computer readable medium having computer readable program code means, the computer readable program code means comprising program code means (col. 4, line 52 and col. 7, lines 19-29);

This independent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 16, Ingrassia teaches, receiving a request for the electronic document associated with the domain name, the electronic document having multiple versions, each of the versions being identified by a creation time-stamp indicating a creation time of the corresponding version, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document in col. 7, lines 30-65; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp and the requested time-stamp, a machine corresponding to a version of the domain name for a time period corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22) and transmitting an indication of the identified machine storing the electronic document corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 22-44). Ingrassia did not

teach, a "domain name", but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 17 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 18 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3

With respect claim 19 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 20 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 21 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 22, Ingrassia teaches, a memory (col. 4, line 51-52) for storing a database identifying a machine storing an electronic document (col. 4, lines 44-48) corresponding to said domain name for a plurality of time periods (col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58, and col. 16, lines 22-52); a processor (col. 4, line 48-51) operatively coupled to said memory (col. 4, line 51-52) configured to receive a request for an electronic document associated with the domain name (col. 7, lines 30-65 and

col. 16, lines 22-52), said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a creation time-stamp indicating a creation time of the corresponding version, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document (col. 7, lines 49-62); access the database as a function of said creation time-stamp and the requested time-stamp to identify a machine corresponding to a version of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 7, lines 16-18 and col. 8, lines 34-44); and transmit an indication of the identified machine storing electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 11-19). Ingrassia did not teach, a "domain name", but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 23 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 24 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect to claim 25 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 26 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 27 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 28 this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 15.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/03/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1.   Applicant argues: Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest "receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp including a creation time of a desired version of a multiple version document" as required by each of the independent claims of the present invention, as amended has been considered but is not persuasive based on the Applicant is arguing the amendment to the independent claims. Therefore, this argument is considered "moot". The claim language does not disclose or suggest to the Examiner that the timestamp issued is "received by a server with a request for the electronic document from a client with the time-stamp identifying a particular version, as required by each of the independent claims, as amended." In dependent claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 recite "a method ... comprising the steps of: receiving a request for said electronic document, said request including a requested time-stamp ...; ... said requested time-stamp a machine storing a version of said electronic document ...; and transmitting said electronic document ... from said

identified machine" in claim 1. Claim 8 recites "a system for storing an electronic document having multiple versions, ..., said system comprising: a memory for storing said multiple versions of said electronic document ...; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to: receive a request for said electronic document, said request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time ..; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp ...; and transmit said electronic document ... said requested time-stamp from said identified machine." Claim 15 recites "an article of manufacture ..., said article of manufacture comprising: a computer readable medium having a computer readable program code means embodied thereon, ... causing a computer to: receive a request for said electronic document, ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp a machine storing a version ...; and transmit said electronic document ... from said identified machine." Claim 16 recites "a method for resolving a domain name, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a request for an electronic document ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp ...; and transmitting an indication of said identified machine storing ...". Claim 22 recites "a system for resolving a domain name, said system comprising: "a memory for storing a database identifying machine ...; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, ... to: receive a request for an electronic document associated with said domain name, ...; access said database as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp to identify ...; and transmit an indication of said identified machine ...". Claim 28 recites "an article of manufacture for resolving a domain name, ... comprising: a computer readable medium having

computer readable program code ..., ... to: receive a request for an electronic

document associated with said domain name, ...; identify as a function of said creation

time-stamp and said requested time-stamp a machine ...; and transmit an indication of

said identified machine ...".

The Examiner carefully drew up a correspondence of each of Applicant's claimed

limitations, one or more referenced passages in Ingrassia, what is well known in the art

and what is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made.

The Examiner is entitled to give limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111   Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

*During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable
interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims
during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once
issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA
1969).<*

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Applicant's disclosure.

Popp et al (US 6,249,291) discloses a domain name in col. 7, lines 1-12.

Papierniak et al (US 6,151,601) discloses a domain name in col. 16, lines 20-46.

Allard et al (US 5,991,802) discloses a URL and HTML.

Inquiries

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687

for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Unofficial communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1113.

E. Colbert
April 15, 2003